

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/894,487	06/28/2001		Klaus Dillinger	21795	5915	
535	7590	08/02/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	THE FIRM OF KARL F ROSS 5676 RIVERDALE AVENUE				SMITH, RUTH S	
	PO BOX 900			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
RIVERDAL	RIVERDALE (BRONX), NY 10471-0900					

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Tout	人
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/894,487	DILLINGER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ruth S. Smith	3737	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a conclusion of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thi od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO tute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 2a)⊠ This action is FINAL. 2b)□ T 3)□ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	his action is non-final. wance except for formal ma		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-21 is/are withd 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration. ·		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam		•	
,	accepted or b) objected to		
Applicant may not request that any objection to t Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur	ents have been received. ents have been received in priority documents have bee	Application No	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies no	t received.	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview	Summary (PTO-413)	
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No	r(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Regarding claims 1,2,10,11, the disclosure does not adequately disclose how electromagnetic (EM) spectra containing "homeopathic" information is obtained and stored in music compression format. Although the present invention admits that it is known to obtain and store low frequency (0-22 KHz) homeopathic EM spectra as disclosed in previous patent (5,830,140 to Dillinger et al. - not expressly incorporated by reference), the current specification does not set forth any procedures for obtaining an analog electromagnetic spectrum representing homeopathic information - but rather appears to be concerned with accessing previously obtained data from a network data bank. In addition, the present disclosure does not address how obtained long wave electromagnetic spectra (current specification p. 3 lines 19-22) are stored in music compression format. For example, Dillinger superimposes the electromagnetic spectra on a carrier wave (such as 10 Hz), however the present disclosure does not address whether the digitized electromagnetic spectra is converted to a higher frequency or superimposed on a carrier wave (analogous to Dillinger) so as to be stored in MP3 format, or music compression format for that matter.

The specification does not adequately disclose what wavelengths are obtained and applied for "homeopathic" therapy. Except for 5,830,140 (which is not expressly incorporated by reference), there is no mention whatsoever of specific wavelengths suitable for the present invention. For example, what wavelengths correspond to treatment of stress, digestive, disorders, headaches, etc.? It is further unclear whether the wavelengths used are similar or different from those used in the '140 patent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillinger et al in view of Kim. Dillinger et al. shows that it is known to obtain and store electromagnetic information representing homeopathic information in digital format for later reproduction and direct therapy by stimulation of e.g., sensory organs (col. 2 lines 3-9, col. 5 lines 4-13) wherein the characteristic information is superimposed on carrier .waves (col. 4 line 63 - col. 5 line 1). Dillinger et al. differs from the claimed invention in that storage/reproduction of the electromagnetic information in compressed musical format is not specifically addressed. Kim demonstrates that it is known to stimulate sensory organs via (computer reproduced) music for therapy (e.g., stress relief, etc.) based on a physiological indication (col. 3 lines 52-54). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the carrier waves of Dillinger et al. to mere higher frequency (audio) carrier waves for music therapy as taught by Kim for effective natural therapy of sensory organs and relief of stress as is known in the art. Dillinger et al. also discloses wherein the data may first be digitally summed and weighted by the digital processor (col. 3 lines 40-47). Dillinger et al. differ from the claimed invention in that storage/access of the electromagnetic information via a global computer network is not specifically addressed. Kim demonstrates that it is known to use computer reproduced digital information for naturopathic therapy (e.g., stress relief, etc.) based on a physiological indication (col. 3 lines 52-54). Kim further discloses wherein the digital data may be accessed/transferred via the Internet (col. 2 lines 40-44, col. 3 lines 58-60) and selected from a home page (70). See also col. 5 line 49 - col. 6 line 35. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store/access the digital information of Dillinger et al. via a web page and the Internet as taught by Kim (as opposed to a CD-ROM) for increased user access and availability to most recently updated programs.

Claims 2 and 11 are rejected under é5 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillinger in view of Kim and further in view of Kehr et al. Kim et al. disclose accessing music for therapy over the Internet, however, MP3 format is not addressed explicitly. Kehr et al. generally demonstrates that it is well known to use MP3 format for storage and retrieval of music over the Internet e.g., (0274). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use MP3 format in the invention as taught by Dillinger in view of Kim for effective transfer of music over the Internet as is well known in the art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 29, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It should be noted that applicant did not cancel claims 12-21 as indicated in the remarks on page 10 of the amendment filed 4/29/05.

Applicant's attention is invited to MPEP 608.01(p) which states that essential subject matter can be incorporated by reference into an application, however, the application must specifically set forth that such patents are being "incorporated by reference". Mere reference to another patent is not an incorporation of anything therein into the application containing such reference for the purpose of the disclosure required by 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The material referred to in the above rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph is considered to be essential subject matter. Furthermore, one cannot incorporate by reference patents published in a foreign country.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruth S. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4745. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 AM-4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 571-272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ruth S. Smith Primary Examiner